REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-8, 12, 24-27, 29-31, 33, 35, 38 and 39 are rejected. Claims 1, 8, 4, 26, 31 and 38 are amended. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments made herein.

112 Rejections

Claims have been amended herein to obviate the rejection of Claims 1-7, 31 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 112. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims and under 35 U.S.C. 112.

102 Rejection

Claims 8, 12, 26, 31, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reynolds et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,225). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as is recited in Claims 8, 12, 26, 31, and 39 is neither shown nor suggested by Reynolds et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 8 which sets forth a method for synthesizing and synchronizing a timing reference signal in a network that includes:

> ... receiving a network packet containing data representing a timing reference signal at said target device from a source device that receives said timing reference signal....adjusting said constant frequency signal based on said comparison of said timing reference signal and said constant frequency signal.

Independent Claims 26 and 39 recite limitations similar to those of Claim 8. Claim12 depends from Claim 8 and Claim 31 depends from Claim 24 (addressed below) and recite further limitations of the Claimed invention.

Reynolds et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for synthesizing and synchronizing a timing reference signal in a network that includes "receiving a network packet containing data representing a timing reference at said target device from a source device that receives said timing reference signal" and adjusting a constant frequency signal based on a comparison of said "timing reference signal and said constant frequency signal." Reynolds et al. only shows a system for recovering clock signals. Reynolds et al. discloses that a media sync signal and transmission clock signal that are generated at a master node (equated in the Office Action to the recited source device) are correlated to generate phase correlation information that is transmitted to a slave node.

In marked contrast, Applicants' Claim 8 (independent Claims contain similar limitations) requires that a generated constant reference signal be synchronized to a timing signal that is received by a source device. Specifically, while Reynolds is concerned with correlating signals that are generated at a master node (equated in the Office Action to the source device of Applicants' Claims) from which a clock signal is recovered at a slave node (equated in the Office Action with the target device of Applicants' Claims) to which the signals are transmitted, Applicants' Claim 1 (independent Claims include similar limitations) requires that a signal that is generated by a target device be adjusted based on a signal that is received by a source device (as opposed to being generated thereat).

Consequently, Reynolds et al. does not teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as is set forth in Claims 8, 26 and 39.Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Reynolds et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 8, 26 and 39 and, as such, Claims 8, 26 and 39 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants also respectfully submit that Reynolds et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 12 dependent on Claim 8, and Claim 31 dependent on Claim 24 (whose allowability is discussed below). The Applicants respectfully submit that these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by Reynolds et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,225). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as is recited in Claim 30 is neither shown nor suggested by Reynolds et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 26 which sets forth an embodiment of the present invention that includes:

> ... an element for extracting said data representing said timing reference signal from said asynchronous network communication packet wherein said timing reference signal is received by a source device.

Reynolds et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for providing a timing reference signal in a network that includes "an element for extracting said data representing said timing reference signal from said asynchronous network communication packet wherein

said timing reference signal is received by a source device." Reynolds et al. only shows a system for recovering clock signals. Reynolds et al. discloses that a media sync signal and transmission clock signal that are generated at a master node (equated in the Office Action to the recited source device) are correlated to generate phase correlation information that is transmitted to a slave node.

In marked contrast, Applicants' independent Claim 26 defines an element that permits data representing a timing reference that is received by a source device to be extracted from an asynchronous network package. Specifically, while Reynolds is concerned with signals that are generated at a master node (equated in the Office Action to the source device of Applicants' Claims) from which a clock signal is recovered at a slave node (equated in the Office Action with the target device of Applicants' Claims), Applicants' independent Claim 26 delimits a target device element that extracts data from an asynchronous communication packet that represents a timing signal that is received by a source device.

Consequently, Reynolds et al. does not teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as is set forth in Claim 30.Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Reynolds et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 30 and as such, Claim 30 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 1, 2, 4-6, 24, 25, 27, 29, 33, 35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Nichols et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,073). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as is recited in Claim 1, 2, 4-6, 24, 25, 27, 29, 33, 35 and 38 is neither shown nor suggested by Nichols et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth an embodiment of the present invention including:

> ... producing a synthesized timing reference signal, said synthesized timing reference signal being synchronized with said timing signal received at said source device by reference to said transmitted data at said target device.

Independent Claims 26 and 39 recite limitations similar to those of Claim 8. Claim 12 depends from Claim 8 and Claim 31 depends from Claim 24 (addressed below) and recite further limitations of the Claimed invention.

Nichols et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for providing a timing reference signal in a network that includes receiving a timing signal at a source device" and "producing a synthesized timing reference signal, said synthesized timing reference signal being synchronized with said timing signal received at said source device by reference to said transmitted data at said target device." Nichols et al. only shows an adaptive clock recovery system for circuit emulation service. Nichols et al. discloses that data packets received from an external source are employed to control the frequency of a locally generated clock.

In marked contrast, Applicants' Claim 1 (independent Claims 24, 25, 33 and 38 contain similar limitations) requires that a synthesized timing reference signal be synchronized to a timing signal that is received by a source device. Specifically, while Nichols is concerned with using data generated at a source node (equated in the Office Action to the source device of Applicants' Claims) to control the frequency of a clock located at a destination node (equated in the Office Action with the target device of Applicants' Claims),

Applicants' Claim 1 (independent Claims 24, 25, 33 and 38 contain similar limitations) requires that a signal that is produced by a target device be synchronized with a signal that is received by a source device (as opposed to being generated thereat).

Consequently, Nichols et al. does not teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as is set forth in Claims 1, 24, 25, 33 and 38. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Nichols et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 1, 24, 25, 33 and 38 and, as such, Claims 1, 24, 25, 33 and 38 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants also respectfully submit that Nichols et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2, and 4-6 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 27 dependent on Claim 24, Claim 29 dependent on Claim 25, Claim 35 dependent on Claim 33 and Claim 38 dependent on Claim 24 (whose allowability is discussed below). The Applicants respectfully submit that these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed remarks, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Applicants' Claim 1 (independent Claims 24, 25, 33 and 38 contain similar limitations) requires that a signal that is produced by a target device be synchronized with a signal that is received by a source device (as opposed to being generated thereat).

Consequently, Nichols et al. does not teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as is set forth in Claims 1, 24, 25, 33 and 38. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Nichols et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 1, 24, 25, 33 and 38 and, as such, Claims 1, 24, 25, 33 and 38 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants also respectfully submit that Nichols et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2, and 4-6 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 27 dependent on Claim 24, Claim 29 dependent on Claim 25, Claim 35 dependent on Claim 33 and Claim 38 dependent on Claim 24 (whose allowability is discussed below). The Applicants respectfully submit that these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed remarks, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 11/3, 2004

Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060